



# City Research Online

## City St George's, University of London

**Citation:** Reynolds, C., Takacs, B., Ignatiev, I., Tenev, D. & Penev, V. (2021). Calculating GHGE impacts and carbon labels for generic meals. Paper presented at the LEAP Conference, 6 Dec 2021, Online.

This is the accepted version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version. To cite this item please consult the publisher's version.

**Permanent repository link:** <https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/27236/>

**Copyright and Reuse:** Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, unless otherwise indicated, provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way. For full details of reuse please refer to [City Research Online policy](#).



# Calculating GHGE impacts and carbon labels for generic meals

Christian Reynolds, Berill Takacs, Ianko Ignatiev, Dinko Tenev, Victor Penev

LEAP 2021, 10:50 - 11:05, 6 December 2021

Dr Christian Reynolds

*Centre for Food Policy, City, University of London*



**@sartorialfoodie**

[christian.reynolds@city.ac.uk](mailto:christian.reynolds@city.ac.uk)

[www.city.ac.uk](http://www.city.ac.uk)

**Centre for  
Food Policy**

Shaping an effective food system

# We need sustainable recipes tools and data

- **Public engagement/communication need**

#1 ask



*“how/what can I cook sustainably this at home?”*

*“what are the impacts of this recipe?”*

We need this information to empower citizens!

People do not think in **ingredients**, they think in **recipes**


- **Industry need**

Need for communication around sustainable menu development and recipe design.

- **Policy need**

Need for data / visualisations of nutrition and food education, pack and portion advice etc.

Are there recipes that meet or are within the **Eat-Lancet** ?



# This builds on previous NLP and recipe work

LEAP 2021 Poster for the project: Communicating the environmental impact of plant based recipes – funded by the Alpro foundation (2021).

**frontiers**  
in Artificial Intelligence

PERSEPECTIVE  
published: 23 February 2021  
doi: 10.3389/frai.2020.621577

**Using Natural Language Processing and Artificial Intelligence to Explore the Nutrition and Sustainability of Recipes and Food**

Marieke van Erp<sup>1†</sup>, Christian Reynolds<sup>2†</sup>, Diana Maynard<sup>3</sup>, Alain Starke<sup>4</sup>, Rebecka Ibáñez Martín<sup>5</sup>, Frederic Andres<sup>6</sup>, Maria C. A. Leite<sup>7</sup>, Damien Alvarez de Toledo<sup>8</sup>, Ximena Schmidt Rivera<sup>9</sup>, Christoph Trattner<sup>4</sup>, Steven Brewer<sup>4</sup>, Carla Adriano Martins<sup>10</sup>, Alana Kluczkowski<sup>10</sup>, Angelina Frankowska<sup>10</sup>, Sarah Bridle<sup>10</sup>, Renata Bertazzi Levy<sup>11</sup>, Fernanda Rauber<sup>11</sup>, Jacqueline Tereza da Silva<sup>10</sup> and Libe Bosma<sup>12</sup>

**OPEN ACCESS**

**Edited by:** Tomaz Erjavec, Institut Jozef Stefan (IJZ), Slovenia

**Reviewed by:** Stefano Compagno, Omega S.p.A., Italy; Arim Zoravicki, Saints Cyril and Methodius University of Skopje, North Macedonia

**\*Correspondence:** Marieke van Erp mariev@unipr.nl; christian.reynolds@sheffield.ac.uk

**†These authors have contributed equally to this work**

**Specialty section:** This article was submitted to AI in Food, Agriculture and Water, a section of the journal Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence

**Received:** 26 October 2020  
**Accepted:** 10 December 2020  
**Published:** 23 February 2021

**CITATION:** van Erp M, Reynolds C, Maynard D, Starke A, Ibáñez Martín R, Andres F, Leite MCA, Alvarez de Toledo D, Schmidt Rivera X, Trattner C, Brewer S, Adriano Martins C, Kluczkowski A, Frankowska A, Bridle S, Levy RB, Rauber F, Tereza da Silva J and Bosma L (2021) Using Natural Language Processing and Artificial Intelligence to Explore the Nutrition and Sustainability of Recipes and Food. *Front. Artif. Intell.* 3:621577. doi: 10.3389/frai.2020.621577

**INTRODUCTION**

Today's big societal challenges are increasingly analyzed from a data-driven perspective (van Veenstra and Kotterink, 2017), while the universal pervasiveness of food and its inherent multidisciplinary nature (Deutsch and Miller, 2007) enable it as an accessible window into every culture and time period. Many global challenges are directly related to food, nutrition, and sustainability.<sup>1</sup> At least 6 of the UN's Sustainable Development Goals involve food (UN, 2015). The food system is linked to 30% of total greenhouse gas emissions (Mbow et al., 2019), and healthcare costs are increasing due to diet-related issues (Schulze et al., 2018; Branca et al., 2019); 60%+ of adults in the United Kingdom and

**FOOTNOTES:** <sup>1</sup>Food analysis was an essential entry point to explore cultures in early anthropological works; for example, as a proxy to understand material cultures, material practices, taboos, and social relations and rituals. Later, food has become an important focus of analysis to theorize colonialism and the machinery of empire, globalization, and more recently, urbanization and political ecology.

Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence | www.frontiersin.org February 2021 | Volume 3 | Article 621577

Available online at [www.sciencedirect.com](http://www.sciencedirect.com)

ScienceDirect  
Energy Procedia 123 (2017) 220–227

Energy Procedia

1st International Conference on Sustainable Energy and Resource Use in Food Chains, ICSEF 2017, 19–20 April 2017, Berkshire, UK

Energy embodied in household cookery: the missing part of a sustainable food system? Part 1: A method to survey and calculate representative recipes

Christian J. Reynolds<sup>a,b,\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup>University of Sheffield, Department of Geography, Faculty of Social Sciences, Water Street, Sheffield, S3 7ND, UK  
<sup>b</sup>University of South Australia, Division of Information Technology, Engineering and the Environment, Adelaide, SA, 5001, Australia

**ABSTRACT**

This paper firstly reviews the current state of knowledge on sustainable cookery and the environmental impacts of the food consumption phase. It then uses the example of a dish of roast beef and Yorkshire pudding to explore energy use in food production and consumption. Part 1 of this paper conducts a meta-analysis of 33 roast beef and Yorkshire pudding recipes in order to create a representative recipe for analysis. Part 2 of this paper then uses life cycle assessment and energy use data is coupled with the representative recipe of roast beef and Yorkshire pudding, to calculate the embodied energy of the meal. Seven interventions are modelled to illustrate how sustainable cookery can play a role as part of a sustainable food system. Interventions show that sustainable cookery has the potential to reduce cookery related energy use by 18%, and integrating sustainable cookery within a sustainable food system has the potential to reduce the total energy use by 55%. Finally, the paper discusses the issue of how the adoption of the sustainable cookery agenda may help or hinder attempts to shift consumers towards sustainable diets.

© 2017 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd.  
Peer review under responsibility of the scientific committee of the 1st International Conference on Sustainable Energy and Resource Use in Food Chains.

**Keywords:** Energy demand and resource use in food consumption; life cycle assessment; cooking; home-made meals; Environmental impacts; LCA; food; meal; food energy and water usage; energy and resource use in food consumption

\* Corresponding author. Tel.: +44-7448-934888.  
E-mail address: c.reynolds@sheffield.ac.uk

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egypro.2017.07.245>

<https://dx.doi.org/10.3389/frai.2020.621577>

Comparing the environmental impacts of recipes from four different recipe databases using Natural Language Processing

Christian Reynolds, Benji Takacs, Anastasia Kimashevskaya, Astaug Angelsen, Rebecka Ibáñez Martín, Steve Brewer, Marieke van Erp, Alain Starke, Diana Maynard, Christoph Trattner

**ABSTRACT**

The calculation of environmental impacts from recipes remains a barrier to effective uptake of sustainable diets. In our project, we use pilot digital humanities methods to explore digitised recipe texts from websites in English, Dutch and German. Using the natural language processing toolkit GATE [1], we have developed customised tools to automatically extract ingredients, quantities and units from 220,168 indexed recipes and match them to a food environmental impact database of 4500 ingredients (using the classification system FoodEx2). This database, based on environmental data from Poore and Nemecek (2018), provided Land Use (m<sup>2</sup>FU), GHG Emissions (kg CO<sub>2</sub>eq/FU, IPCC 2013 incl. CC feedstocks), Eutrophying Emissions (g PO<sub>4</sub>-eq/FU, GML2 Baseline), Stress-Weighted Water Use (L/FU), and Freshwater Withdrawals (L/FU) for each ingredient. This allowed the calculation of these impacts at the mean, 5% and 95% confidence level per recipe and per portion. This has enabled us to explore the environmental impacts of vegan, vegetarian and non-vegetarian recipes if we were to cook these recipes using contemporary ingredients. To validate this tool we manually calculated the impacts of 50 recipes from 4 websites: BBC - Good Food, Albert Heijn/Aldi/Deen, AlproRecipes.com (Trattner et al. 2017) and Koolbar (Trattner et al. 2018) and compared these to the results from our tool.

Nutrition information was sourced from the USDA FoodData Central (McKillop et al. 2021) and McCance and Widdowson's Composition of Foods Integrated Dataset (Public Health England 2016). Environmental and Nutrition information was matched to two classification systems: 4500 ingredients (FoodEx2 classification system) and 2842 ingredients (USDA Nutrient Database for Standard Reference, Release 24 classification system).

**REFERENCES**

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

CITY OF SHEFFIELD, TMS, KNAW HUMANITIES CHARTER, UNIVERSITY OF BERGEM, WAGENINGEN UNIVERSITY & RESEARCH


## Multiple studies already

- Nutritional and health studies (Reinivuo et al., 2009; Trattner et al., 2017)
- Computational linguistics (Jurafsky, 2015),
- Computational gastronomy (Jain et al., 2015)
- Online shopping recommendations (Aiello et al., 2019)
- Semantic web (Hausmann et al., 2019)

This is still a young field of investigation!


# Other Recipe NLP research

Analysis of submitted recipes (Asano and Biermann, 2019)




Share of submitted recipes containing different tags from 2005-2018 as a time-series. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-019-0316-0>

Flavour networks (Ahnert 2013) [10.1186/2044-7248-2-4](https://doi.org/10.1186/2044-7248-2-4)




## Existing food ontology groupings



Using Word Embeddings to Learn a Better Food Ontology

<https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2020.584784>

## Healthfulness Assessment of Recipes Shared on Pinterest



The number of followers was presented in tertiles (T1, T2, and T3)

Relationship between pinners' popularity and their recipe ingredients.

(Cheng et al 2021) <https://doi.org/10.2196/25757>

# Ecolabels are becoming mainstream

There are many (10+) environmental Ecolabels now emerging with different food label designs, with combined and multicomponent scores

## Sustainable food profiling models to inform the development of food labels that account for nutrition and the environment: a systematic review

Anne Charlotte Bunge, Kremlin Wickramasinghe, Jessica Renzella, Michael Clark, Mike Rayner, Holly Rippin, Afton Halloran, Nia Roberts, João Breda

Sustainable food profiling models (SFPs) are the scientific basis for the labelling of food products according to their environmental and nutritional impact, allowing consumers to make informed choices. We identified ten SFPs that score individual foods according to at least two environmental indicators, with the most common being greenhouse gas emissions (n=10) and water use (n=8). Six models additionally assessed the nutritional quality of foods and presented different methods to combine nutritional and environmental indicators. Key advantages of identified models include a wide range in system boundaries, reference units, approaches for defining cutoff values, design proposals for food labelling schemes, and the comprehensive geographical scope of the lifecycle inventory databases used in the development phase of the model. Key disadvantages of identified models include inconsistent methods for food classification and poor replicability due to unclear methods, unavailable code for environmental and nutritional impact calculation, and unclear cutoff values. We found that few SFPs to date account for at least two environmental impact factors, and even fewer include nutritional values or other dimensions of sustainability. This systematic review highlights the need to use consistent components and to develop national and international reference values for the classification of sustainable food to enable standardised food labelling.



[https://doi.org/10.1016/S2542-5196\(21\)00231-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2542-5196(21)00231-X)

	Model name										% of SFPs fulfilling criterion	
	Menu sustainability index <sup>18</sup>	Dietary environmental index <sup>25</sup>	SusDISH-LEH <sup>17</sup>	Avadi <sup>19</sup>	Masset <sup>20</sup>	Leach <sup>21</sup>	CONE-LCA <sup>22</sup>	Eternity score <sup>23</sup>	Food carbon scope <sup>24</sup>	Beelgong Eco-Score <sup>24</sup>		
Factors of environmental impact	Greenhouse gas emission											100%
	Land use <sup>a</sup>											60%
	Biodiversity loss											30%
	Water use <sup>1</sup>											80%
	Eutrophication											20%
	Acidification											10%
Nutritional indicators	Other <sup>b</sup>											80%
	Protein											40%
	Fibre											50%
	Vitamins <sup>5</sup>											50%
	Minerals <sup>6</sup>											60%
	Unsaturated fat											50%
	Saturated fat											50%
	Sugar											20%
	Sodium											50%
	Energy											30%
System boundary	Cradle-to-farm gate											40%
	Cradle-to-consumer											30%
	Cradle-to-grave											20%
	Adjustable											10%
Reference value	Mass basis (in g, kg, or tonne)											60%
	Serving size											40%
	Energy basis (in kcal)											20%
	Per kg of protein											10%



## Environmental Information

Carbon footprint: **867.0 gCO<sub>2</sub>e** per serving (28.0% fair daily food emissions)

Find out more at [myemissions.green](https://myemissions.green)



# Generic Meals and carbon labels

**Edamam**, a provider of nutrition data and semantic solutions for businesses in the food, health, and wellness sectors (<https://developer.edamam.com>)

- Integrated a food environmental impact database of 2,842 ingredients (using the classification system of the USDA Nutrient Database for Standard Reference, Release 24). This food environmental impact database was based on environmental data from Poore and Nemecek (2018) and was supplied by City.
- For some items which are not part of USDA food list Edamam used in-house nutrition experts to map them to USDA items.
- Edamam has labeled about **5 million recipes in the English language web** with CO2 labels ranking from A+ (best) to G (worst) and is making those searchable via its Recipe Search API.

**Edamam's Generic meals** are a database of 180,000+ recipes that encompass more than 90% of what restaurants offer/commonly cooked at home.

- Similar recipes are clustered based on titles after removing certain non essential words from the title. These recipes represent the initial generic meal set.
- Compare recipes based on nutrition and content and remove any outliers. From the rest of the recipes Edamam build a combined recipes for which they also create a distribution of labels and nutrition among the recipe population. CO2e is one of the values which is part of this calculation.
- Edamam matched the CO2e data and carbon labels to the Generic meals database.



Edamam Partners with City University of London to Provide CO2 Imprint of Recipes and Meals

*Edamam leverages research by City University and its proprietary algorithms to calculate CO2 impact of 5 million recipes and 70,000 most commonly eaten meals.*





# Results: YES! Eat-Lancet compatible recipes!

196,005 recipes with 100% ingredients matched to CO2e data. Mean 2101.45g of CO2e per portion, (SD 3472.02g)

Information provided in grams of CO2e per **portion**, per **Kcal**, per g of **protein**


**Eat-Lancet recipes:** Assume consumption of this recipe is scaled to meet 2500 kcal, and protein 56g, is the scaled recipe below 1780g of CO2e.

**5,619 recipes met this criteria! (2.8%)** Mean 180.87g of CO2e per portion, (SD 117.20g)



# Different ways to cut the data... Health/Diet

Metadata presented for Meal type, **Health/Diet** type, Cuisine type, Dish type, and Ingredients per recipe





Different carbon impact spreads across Diet choice types, but also the number of recipes matters!

DASH, Vegan, and Vegetarian recipes had the lowest mean, median and IQR of any specific health/diet type.



	SUGAR CONSCIOUS	No Classification	VEGETARIAN	MEDITERRANEAN	GLUTEN_FREE	VEGAN	KETO FRIENDLY	PALEO	DASH
Count	49,690	29,031	111,263	37,869	81,000	24,651	22,372	11,270	7,086
Avg. g CO2e per portion	2,313.34	4,320.09	833.55	1,417.64	2,013.42	402.28	2,349.80	1,881.94	816.31

# Different ways to cut the data... Cuisine type




There are a % of recipes in most cuisines that meet the Eat-Lancet

# Different ways to cut the data... Dish type





There are a % of recipes that meet the Eat-Lancet – Dish types vary in footprint, but a problem with sample size/tagging

# Different ways to cut the data... Ingredients



	Beef	Lamb	Shrimp	Cheese	Pork	Chicken	Eggs	Fish	Tofu	Beans	Peas	Lentil	Nuts
Mean g of CO <sub>2</sub> e per portion	10,265.96	8,139.05	3,448.71	2,388.032	2,890.13	2890.13	1,552.63	3,086.02	1,054.26	2,473.38	2,057.60	1,742.12	1,289.52
Count	11,984	1,776	3,890	44,959	18,411	18,411	55,074	3,795	1,168	13,157	302	1,312	33,835
# of Eat-Lancet	0	0	4	48	17	14	542	8	12	608	31	206	1802
% Eat-Lancet	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	1.0%	0.2%	1.0%	4.6%	10.3%	15.7%	5.3%

# Different ways to cut the data... Ingredients



Different carbon label spreads across ingredient types, but also the number of recipes matters!

# Key take-aways

- We have a database for CO<sub>2</sub>e of ~200,000 commonly cooked recipes in the English language (web)
  - Information provided in grams of CO<sub>2</sub>e per **portion**, per **Kcal**, per g of **protein** and **carbon labels**
  - This database, and API can easily be used on menus, cookbooks etc.
- Recipes from different cuisines, dishes, health/diets, and protein sources all can **NOW** be cooked to meet the Kcal and Protein requirements set out by the EAT-Lancet.
- DASH, Vegan, and Vegetarian recipes had the lowest mean, median and IQR of any specific health/diet type.
- We need to think about how carbon/eco labels convey complexity when compared to specific diet requirements (e.g Eat-Lancet).

# Please do get in touch

Dr Christian Reynolds

*Centre for Food Policy, City, University of London*



**@sartorialfoodie** [christian.reynolds@city.ac.uk](mailto:christian.reynolds@city.ac.uk)

The Centre for Food Policy, City, University of London offers the following courses

- **Nutrition and Food Policy BSc (Hons), with Distance Learning option**

Undergraduate degree

- **Food Policy MSc/PGDip/PGCert, with Distance Learning option**

Postgraduate taught degree

- **PhD/MPhil Food Policy**

Postgraduate research degree

<https://www.city.ac.uk/prospective-students/courses/postgraduate/food-policy>



Thank you again to all my numerous collaborators and Edamam!